OIPE VO	IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE	
Vina .	Patent Application of:	) Examiner: Christopher S. ) McCarthy
FATA TRADEMANT	Cheryl Hite et al.	) Art Unit: 2113
Applio	cation No. 09/837,251	)
Filed:	April 18, 2001	)
For:	METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR CONCURRENT ERROR IDENTIFICATION IN RESOURCE SCHEDULING SYSTEM	) ) )

MS Issue Fee Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Dear Sir:

Applicants note the Examiner's reasons for allowance. No inference or conclusion should be drawn that Applicants believe the Examiner's reasons for allowance are the only reasons the claims are patentable. Indeed, the Examiner's statement appears to focus on primary reasons for allowance of the independent claims and no reference is made to other reasons for allowance. Also, no reference is made to any of the dependent claims, which include other and/or additional inventive aspects that are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art. Thus, Applicants interpret the Examiner's statement to be in no way exhaustive relative to either the independent or dependent claims.

Patent 09/837,251

Atty. Docket No.: BLPU.P003

Moreover, although Applicants agree with the Examiner's ultimate conclusion that the inventions, as claimed herein, are patentable over the prior art, there are many inventions described in the above-referenced application that are not claimed herein. Indeed, these inventions may or may not include one, some, or all of the features set forth in the Examiner's statement.

Respectfully submitted, Courtney Staniford & Gregory & LLP

Date: August 18, 2005

Barbara B. Courtney, Reg. No. 42,442

Tel. 408-342-1902

Courtney Staniford & Gregory & LLP 10001 N. De Anza Blvd., Suite 300 Cupertino CA 95014